

REMARKS

Final Rejection

After dutifully responding to a series of restriction requirements, Applicants were very much surprised to have received a Final Rejection. In light of these restriction requirements, Applicants respectfully submit that this action should not have been made final. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the finality of this action be withdrawn.

Amendment To Claims

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 7 to recite the feature of “inputting a display signal into a gate electrode of the current controlling thin film transistor in response to a second reset signal at the same time as the first reset signal.” This feature is supported by, for example, paragraph [0193] in the publication of the present application (US 2002/0130828).

Applicants have also deleted the feature of “wherein the light emitting element emits a light only during a period that starts with the start of the output of the n counter signals and ends as a plurality of first information of each bit of the n bit digital video signals inputted to the display signal generating portion matches a plurality of second information of each of the n counter signals” from independent Claim 7 and added it in new dependent Claim 72. If any fee should be due for this new claim, please charge our deposit account 23/0920.

Accordingly, no new matter is being added. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this amendment and new claim be entered and allowed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner has the following rejections under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a):

1. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kurumisawa et al. (JP 11-295700) in view of Sato et al. (US 5,712,652) and Okumura et al. (US 5,945,972).

2. Claim 15 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kurumisawa, Sato and Okumura and further in view of Honig (US 3,903,857).

3. Claim 16 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kurumisawa, Sato and Okumura and further in view of Kondo (US 4,373,415).

4. Claim 18 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kurumisawa, Sato and Okumura and further in view of Kobayashi (US 4,262,352) and Kinghorn (US 4,574,386).

5. Claim 37 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kurumisawa, Sato and Okumura and further in view of Ouderkirk et al. (US 6,124,971).

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse these rejections, as explained above, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 7.

None of the cited references disclose or suggest this feature of Claim 7.

Therefore, independent Claim 7 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 7 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, the extension of time, and/or the new claim, please charge our deposit account 23-0920.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: July 26, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

Husch Blackwell Sanders LLP
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 526-1533

Customer No. 24628